



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/685,398	10/10/2000	James Richard Kraemer	RSW9-2000-0107-US1	7911

7590 09/19/2007
Esther H. Chong, Esquire
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER

HAMILTON, LALITA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3691

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/19/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/685,398

Applicant(s)

KRAEMER, JAMES RICHARD

Examiner

Lalita M. Hamilton

Art Unit

3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

On April 9, 2007, an Office Action was sent to the Applicant rejecting claims 1-31.

On July 9, 2007, the Applicant responded with arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bove (7,149,713) in view of Jones (7,016,870), as set forth in the previous Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 9, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that the Examiner used "impermissible hindsight" in making the 103 rejection. In response, the Examiner did not use impermissible hindsight. Both Bove and Jones are analogous art, and the Examiner found motivation in combining the two references in order to demonstrate that transmitting any form of an

alert message to the customer would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to allow the customer to know when buy/sell recommendations should be made to keep the portfolio balanced.

The Applicant argues that neither Bove nor Jones discloses or teaches transmitting to a customer an alert message for alerting an imbalance status of a customer's portfolio and a list comprising at least one recommended rebalancing transaction; sending such recommended rebalancing transaction information to a customer in an alert message, so that the customer may accept and initiate rebalancing with a single response; transmitting of the alert message is performed via a first customer-defined communications method; automatically retransmitting an alert message to the customer via a secondary method if a first communication is not successfully executed; transmission of an alert message and execution of transactions listed in an alert message based on the customer's response to the alert message; or the customer's response that results in automatic implementation of the list of rebalancing transactions is contained in a return e-mail, response received on paper including an optical code for retrieving the list, voice sound, or financial kiosk. In response, Jones teaches transmitting to a customer an alert message for alerting an imbalance status of a customer's portfolio and a list comprising at least one recommended rebalancing transaction (Jones teaches a plan monitoring model that transmits alerts—col.27, lines 50-55); sending such recommended rebalancing transaction information to a customer in an alert message, so that the customer may accept and initiate rebalancing with a single response (Jones teaches that based upon

Art Unit: 3691

user's preferences, the system may offer advice on which decision variable should be modified to bring the portfolio back on track (col.28, lines 30-38); transmitting of the alert message is performed via a first customer-defined communications method (Jones teaches that the alert may be displayed using telephone, fax, email, pager, fax, or similar messaging system); automatically retransmitting an alert message to the customer via a secondary method if a first communication is not successfully executed (Jones teaches that the alert may be displayed during a subsequent user session—col.28, lines 30-38); transmission of an alert message and execution of transactions listed in an alert message based on the customer's response to the alert message (Jones teaches that the alert may be displayed using telephone, fax, email, pager, fax, or similar messaging system); and the customer's response that results in automatic implementation of the list of rebalancing transactions is contained in a return e-mail, response received on paper including an optical code for retrieving the list, voice sound, or financial kiosk (Jones teaches that the alert may be displayed using telephone, fax, email, pager, fax, or similar messaging system).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3691

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lalita M. Hamilton whose telephone number is (571) 272-6743. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday (6:30-2:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kalinowski Alexander can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



LALITA M. HAMILTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER